# Macroscopic digestive tract anatomy of two small antelopes, the blackbuck (Antilope cervicapra) and the Arabian sand gazelle (Gazella subgutturosa marica)

Sauer, Cathrine ; Bertelsen, Mads F ; Hammer, Sven ; Lund, Peter ; Weisbjerg, Martin R ; Clauss, Marcus

Abstract: The digestive tract anatomy of 14 blackbucks (Antilope cervicapra) and seven Arabian sand gazelles (Gazella subgutturosa marica) was quantified by dimensions, area and weight. Data from the two small-sized antilopinae were evaluated against a larger comparative data set from other ruminants classified as having either a 'cattle-type' or 'moose-type' digestive system. The digestive anatomy of the blackbuck resembled that of 'cattle-type' ruminants, which corresponds to their feeding ecology and previous studies of solute and particle retention time; however, a surprising exception was the remarkably small omasum in this species, which makes the blackbuck stand out from the general rule of a relatively large omasum in grazing ruminants. Sand gazelles had morphological features that corresponded more to the 'moose type' or an intermediate position, although previous studies of solute and particle retention time had led to the expectation of a more 'cattle-type' anatomy. The results show that outliers to general morphological trends exist, that findings on physiology and anatomy do not always match completely and that differences in the digestive morphology among ruminant species are more difficult to demonstrate at the lower end of the body mass range.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ahe.12214

Title: Macroscopic digestive tract anatomy of two small antelopes, the blackbuck (*Antilope cervicapra*) and the Arabian sand gazelle (*Gazella subgutturosa marica*)

Short title: Blackbuck and sand gazelle digestive anatomy

Cathrine Sauer[1,2]
Mads F. Bertelsen[2]
Sven Hammer[3,4]
Peter Lund[1]
Martin R. Weisbjerg[1]
Marcus Clauss[5]

[1]Department of Animal Science, Aarhus University, AU Foulum, Blichers Allé 20, PO Box 50, DK-8830 Tjele, Denmark
[2]Center for Zoo and Wild Animal Health, Copenhagen Zoo, Roskildevej 38, DK-2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark
[3]Al Wabra Wildlife Preservation, P.O. Box 44069, Doha, State of Qatar
[4]present address: Naturschutz-Tierpark Görlitz, Zittauerstr. 43, D-02826 Görlitz, Germany
[5]Clinic for Zoo Animals, Exotic Pets and Wildlife, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstr. 260, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland.

Corresponding author email: cathrine.sauer@anis.au.dk

Number of figures in the manuscript: 5
Number of tables in the manuscript: 2

Keywords: rumen, reticulum, omasum, abomasum, intestine, cecum, salivary glands, antelope

## Summary

The digestive tract anatomy of 14 blackbucks (*Antilope cervicapra*) and 7 Arabian sand gazelles (*Gazella subgutturosa marica*) was quantified by dimensions, area and weight. Data from the two small-sized antilopinae were evaluated against a larger comparative data set from other ruminants classified as having either a ‘cattle-type’ or ‘moose-type’ digestive system. The digestive anatomy of the blackbuck resembled that of 'cattle-type' ruminants, which corresponds to their feeding ecology and previous studies of solute and particle retention time; however, a surprising exception was the remarkably small omasum in this species, which makes the blackbuck stand out from the general rule of a relatively large omasum in grazing ruminants. Sand gazelles had morphological features that corresponded more to the 'moose-type' or an intermediate position, although previous studies of solute and particle retention time had led to the expectation of a more 'cattle-type' anatomy. The results show that outliers to general morphological trends exist, that findings on physiology and anatomy do not always match completely, and that differences in the digestive morphology among ruminant species are more difficult to demonstrate at the lower end of the body mass range.


## Introduction

Most ruminant species of small body size are classified as ‘concentrate selectors’ or ‘browsers’ (Hofmann, 1989). Of the exceptions, the majority are classified as ‘intermediate feeders’ (e.g., many species of deer and gazelles) while a few are ‘bulk and roughage eaters’ or ‘grazers’ (e.g., the oribi (*Ourebia ourebi*) and the mountain reedbuck (*Redunca fulvorufula*)). With a body mass (BM) of 20 – 55 kg (males being larger than females), the blackbuck is one of the few small ruminants considered to be a strict grazer, including approximately 80% grass in their diet (reviewed by Dittmann *et al.*, 2015). Arabian sand gazelles, another member of the Antilopinae subfamily with a small BM (15 – 30 kg), are considered intermediate feeders including an average of around 40% grass in their diet (reviewed by Dittmann *et al.*, 2015) though with large seasonal variation in forage type preference (Cunningham, 2013).

The classification of ruminants into feeding types has traditionally been based on either observations of feeding ecology, morphophysiological traits of the gastrointestinal tract or a combination of the two. However, recent studies indicate that digestive anatomy is not necessarily a reliable proxy for the diet of a species, though some traits appear to be more common among browsing than grazing species and vice versa. Instead, it has been suggested to classify ruminants as either ‘cattle-type’ or ‘moose-type’ according to their digestive strategy (Clauss *et al.*, 2010b), with ‘cattle-types’ having stratified rumen content, a fast flow of fluid through the reticulorumen (RR) and an uneven pattern of ruminal papillation. In contrast, ‘moose-type’ ruminants have homogenous rumen content, a relatively slower RR fluid flow, and evenly papillated ruminal mucosa.

Fluid throughput and retention of particles in the RR can be measured using indigestible markers, e.g., Cr- or Co-EDTA as solute marker and Cr-mordanted fibers as particle marker. Using this marker system, the mean retention time of both fluid and solid material has been determined in many ruminant species including blackbucks (Hummel *et al*. 2015) and sand gazelles (Dittmann *et al*. 2015). Given the results of these studies, where a clear separation of solute and particle marker excretion was found in both species, we expected both species to have a 'cattle-type' digestive anatomy, e.g., having high reticular crests, thick rumen pillars and a relatively large omasum. In particular, the omasum of the blackbuck was expected to be large, to reabsorb the high amount of fluid passing from the RR of this species, as documented by Hummel *et al*. (2015). The aim of this study was to provide quantitative data on the gross gastrointestinal anatomy of blackbucks and sand gazelles and to determine if predictions regarding digestive tract morphology based on their feeding ecology and previous retention time studies could be confirmed.

# Materials and methods

Data were collected from 14 blackbucks (5 males and 9 females, BM range 20.1 – 30.0 kg) and 7 sand gazelles (all males, BM range 16.1 – 19.2 kg). Four of the blackbucks and all sand gazelles were kept at Al Wabra Wildlife Preservation (AWWP), State of Qatar, on a diet of grass hay ad libitum and limited amounts of fresh lucerne for 4 weeks prior to culling. In addition, blackbucks were fed a small amount of pellets. The remaining ten blackbucks were kept on a diet of ad libitum grass hay, limited amounts of grass haylage and free access to pasture during the day time at Ree Safari Park, Denmark. Pellets had been gradually removed from the diet at day 5 – 4 prior to culling and completely withheld on day 3 – 0. All animals were culled for management reasons except for one blackbuck that died from trauma. Dissections followed a previously described protocol (Sauer *et al*., in press). Not all measures were obtained from each individual animal due to practical limitations or time constraints; in particular, no measurements of omasal laminar surface area and salivary glands of sand gazelles were made. Heads of the blackbucks from Ree Park were frozen prior to dissection of the salivary glands, while salivary gland weight was determined in fresh heads from AWWP blackbucks.

For a comparative evaluation of the anatomical measures of blackbucks and sand gazelles, measurements obtained were plotted against literature data on forestomach anatomy and salivary gland weight of other ruminant species, classified as having either a ‘moose-type’ or ‘cattle-type’ digestive tract (for species and literature sources, see Sauer *et al*. (in press), with additional data from Short (1964), Hofmann and Geiger (1974), Nagy and Regelin (1975), Weston and Cantle (1983), Stafford and Stafford (1993), Staaland *et al*. (1997), and Wang *et al*. (2014)).

To determine the relation between BM and anatomical measures, data were ln-transformed and allometric regression analysis was used to determine the coefficients of the model: $\ln(Y) = \alpha + \beta \times \ln(BM)$, where Y = the anatomical measure, and BM = body mass in kg. The hypothesis of isometric scaling was accepted if 0.33, 0.67 and 1.00 was included in the 95% confidence interval of the BM exponent ($\beta$) of linear dimensions, areas and weights, respectively. ANOVA was used for step-wise model reduction. All statistical analyses were performed using the statistical software R (version 3.1.0, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Significance was accepted at $p \leq 0.05$ with values below 0.1 considered as trends.

# Results and discussion

The stomach of both blackbuck and sand gazelle was comprised of a rumen, reticulum, omasum and abomasum as in all other true ruminants (Figure 1). The rumen was the largest compartment followed by the abomasum, then the reticulum and the omasum. When dissecting the blackbuck omasa for laminar surface area determination, only first, most of the second, and a few of the third order leaves were dissectable, i.e., more than just a small ridge on the basal layer of the omasum. On average, the blackbuck omasum had 9.7 ± 1.1 leaves of first order, 9.4 ± 1.4 leaves of second order, 14.4 ± 5.3 leaves of third order, 3.0 ± 2.1 leaves that were positively identified as fourth order and 4.0 ± 0.7 leaves, were order could not be determined. The size and position of the parotid and mandibular salivary glands of blackbuck are shown on Figure 2, while average anatomical measures of both species are presented in Table 1 and 2.

In blackbucks all RR and omasum size measures correlated poorly to BM (all p-values ≥ 0.1), while abomasum tissue weight and greater curvature length tended to increase with BM ($p = 0.096$ and $p = 0.052$, respectively). The length of the lesser abomasal curvature was not related to BM ($p = 0.203$). Small intestine (SI) length did not correlate to BM ($p = 0.733$), while SI tissue weight increased with BM ($p = 0.019$). Cecum length and tissue weight tended to increase with BM ($p = 0.057$ and $p = 0.059$, respectively). Total large intestine (Total LI, defined as cecum, colon and rectum) was both longer and heavier in larger animals (both $p < 0.03$), while the SI : Total LI length ratio did not correlate to BM ($p = 0.149$). Weight of the parotid salivary glands ($n = 10$, BM: 25.0 ± 3.3 kg, weight: 15.2 ± 3.0 g) tended to increase with BM ($p = 0.051$), while the mandibular glands weight ($n = 6$, BM: 24.1 ± 3.3 kg, weight: 13.0 ± 2.8 g) was unaffected by BM ($p = 0.574$). The expected isometric value was included in the 95% confidence interval for all measures correlating or tending to correlate to BM, though the confidence intervals were very wide in many cases.

The BM range of the seven sand gazelles (16.1 – 19.2 kg) was not wide enough to correlate anatomical measures to BM. Consequently, only means and standard deviations are presented for this species (Table 1 and 2). Even though the BM range of the blackbucks was wider than that of the sand gazelles, the fit of the allometric regression model for most anatomical measures was poor. Thus, to describe the relation between BM and digestive anatomy, data from animals of a wider range of body masses and stages of maturity are needed from both species. Actually, this demonstrates that for species with an inherently narrow range of body masses, intraspecific allometries may be difficult to achieve.

Diet can possibly influence some measures of digestive tract gross anatomy in ruminants, such as omasum size (Lauwers, 1973), weight of the digestive tract (McLeod and Baldwin, 2000) and of the salivary glands (Mathiesen *et al*., 1999). Therefore, using captive animals to investigate the digestive anatomy of any species adds a risk of an unintentional effect of an unnatural diet. To mimic a natural diet as much as possible given the captive conditions, pelleted feed was either withheld or only fed in limited amounts in the time up to culling for both species in the study. However, after a life in captivity with higher quality diets, no periods of fasting and free access to drinking water, long-term adaptations to captivity may exist in the animals investigated in this study.

Blackbucks resembled ‘cattle-type’ ruminants with respect to rumen pillar thickness, reticular crest height and salivary gland weight (Figure 3 and 4), while omasum size parameters were in the range of, and even below, ‘moose-type’ ruminants (Figure 5). When the blackbucks were dissected it was noted that the omasum was small and difficult to identify from the outside of the stomach, i.e., not a separate ‘ball-shaped’ organ as in other ruminants. This finding was consistent across animals from the two facilities (Figure 1). In spite of a potential effect of captive diet on omasum size, the extent of that effect would have to be enormous to explain the difference between the very small omasum observed and the expected size for a grazing ruminant. The fact that blackbucks had a small omasum at both captive facilities (Figure 1), i.e., under different diets and husbandry conditions, suggests that this omasum size is not a dietary artefact, but must be an inherent morphological trait of the blackbuck. This was a surprising finding, since the selectivity factor of the RR ($SF_{RR}$, defined as mean retention time (MRT) of particles in the RR divided by MRT of fluid in the RR) in blackbucks were found to be in the higher end of the range of ‘cattle-type’ ruminants (Hummel *et al.*, 2015), indicating a relatively high fluid flow out of the RR in this species. Thus, we expected to find a particularly large omasum in the blackbuck to reabsorb this fluid, as predicted by Hummel *et al.* (2015). A possible consequence of the particularly small omasum of blackbuck could be a particularly large abomasum to accommodate the inflowing digesta and facilitate the presumably larger amount of gastric secretions needed to counteract the diluting effect of the un-absorbed rumen fluid. Whether ruminant species with a relatively small omasum generally have a relatively large abomasum remains to be investigated. Using the fossil records of pecoran ruminants and tragulids, Clauss and Rössner (2014) speculated that the absence of an omasum in tragulids was a competitive disadvantage that might have contributed to their ecological replacement by pecoran ruminants over time. The example of the blackbuck indicates that the ruminant forestomach system can also function efficiently without a pronounced omasum. The oribi, a grazing ruminant even smaller than the blackbuck, has also been reported as having a smaller omasum than expected (Hofmann, 1973; Stafford and Stafford, 1993). The rareness of this feature, however, with larger omasa present in basically all other ruminant species investigated so far, suggests that this is not a particularly successful adaptation, yet calls for further studies on alternative mechanisms of fluid reabsorption in the few species with small omasa.

Sand gazelles appeared to most resemble ‘moose-types’ for rumen pillar thickness, while the reticular crest height was in the middle range between ‘cattle-types’ and ‘moose-types’ (Figure 3). In the wild, sand gazelles seasonally include large amounts of browse, and hence are classified as intermediate feeders. Based on the apparent differences in $SF_{RR}$ between ‘moose-type’ and ‘cattle-type’ ruminants, Hummel *et al.* (2015) hypothesized that the optimal relation of $MRT_{particles}$ to $MRT_{fluid}$ depends on the type of forage ingested, with higher $SF_{RR}$ in ‘cattle-types’ than ‘moose-types’. Since $SF_{RR}$ of sand gazelles (2.3, Dittmann *et al.*, 2015) is lower than that of blackbucks (3.2, Hummel *et al.*, 2015), we expect the digestive anatomy of sand gazelle to have less pronounced ‘cattle-type’ characteristics than that of the blackbuck, though both species are in the $SF_{RR}$ range of ‘cattle-type’ ruminants (~2.0 – 4.5, Hummel *et al.*, 2005). The typical range of $SF_{RR}$ for ‘moose-type’ ruminants is more narrow (~ 1.0 - 2.0, Hummel *et al.*, 2005) reflecting the fact that ‘moose-type’ ruminants predominantly feed on a browse-only diet, while the ‘cattle-type’ ruminants cover a much wider range of dietary strategies encompassing both intermediate feeders and grazers (Codron and Clauss, 2010b).

Several digestive characteristics of browsing and grazing ruminants have been established as examples of convergent evolution, namely the evolution of high reticular crests (Clauss *et al*., 2010a), greater omasal laminar surface area (Clauss *et al*., 2006), and smaller parotid salivary glands (Hofmann *et al*., 2008) in grazing relative to browsing ruminants. However, confirming convergent evolution of a specific trait may be obscured by species in a transition phase, i.e. species that have changed dietary habits recently withe adaptations of their digestive anatomy 'lagging behind', as discussed by Clauss *et al*. (2008). It can only be speculated if the case of the small blackbuck omasum represents a delay in anatomical adaptations to a grass-based diet.

In conclusion, the present study confirmed that many morphological traits of the digestive tract of the blackbuck correspond to the 'cattle-type' anatomy. A notable exception, however, was the surprising discovery of an unusually small omasum in this species, even smaller in size than reported for 'moose-type' ruminants. For sand gazelles, some morphological results were in line with previous findings in 'moose-type' ruminants, such as rumen pillar thickness and omasum size, whereas others were of an intermediate position. These results indicate that differentiation of the ruminant types is difficult at small body masses (as also evident in the converging regression lines in Figure 3 and 5). Additionally, they show that physiology, as measured by digesta retention times, and morphology do not necessarily yield completely matching results, suggesting that their interplay is either not yet fully understood, or that theories linking the two must include a certain degree of flexibility.


# Acknowledgements

This study was possible because of the kindness of H. E. Sheikh Saoud Bin Mohamed Bin Ali Al-Thani and his support of the Zoo Research Camps 2009-2010 organized by Al Wabra Wildlife Preservation and the Clinic for Zoo Animals, Exotic Pets and Wildlife, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Zurich, and continuing research at his facility. Further, the authors greatly appreciate the donation of additional animals to this study by Ree Safari Park, Denmark. The help of Lena Brix, Andreas Egelund, Jacob Gade, Mette Halck, as well as of Dr. Julia Stagegaard and keepers at Ree Safari Park during dissections was invaluable. Jesper Brinkmann Nielsen is thanked for participating in the dissection of blackbuck salivary glands. Jakob S. Jørgensen is gratefully acknowledged for developing the segmentation algorithm and image analysis software used to determine surface area of the omasal leaves. The authors thank two reviewers for constructive input that improved the manuscript.

## Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflict of interest regarding the content of this manuscript.


## Sources of funding

CS was supported by Aarhus University through a PhD scholarship from the Graduate School of Agriculture, Food and Environment.

# References


Clauss, M., R. R. Hofmann, W. J. Streich, J. Fickel, and J. Hummel, 2010a: Convergence in the macroscopic anatomy of the reticulum in wild ruminant species of different feeding types and a new resulting hypothesis on reticular function. Journal of Zoology **281**, 26–38.

Clauss, M., R. R. Hofmann, J. Hummel, J. Adamczewski, K. Nygren, C. Pitra, W. J. Streich, and S. Reese, 2006: Macroscopic anatomy of the omasum of free-ranging moose (*Alces alces*) and muskoxen (*Ovibos moschatus*) and a comparison of the omasal laminal surface area in 34 ruminant species. Journal of Zoology **270**, 346–358.

Clauss, M., I. Hume, and J. Hummel, 2010b: Evolutionary adaptations of ruminants and their potential relevance for modern production systems. Animal **4**, 979–992.

Clauss, M., T. Kaiser, and J. Hummel, 2008: The morphophysiological adaptations of browsing and grazing mammals; pp. 47–88 in I. Gordon and H. Prins (eds.), The ecology of browsing and grazing. Springer, Berlin.

Clauss, M., and G. E. Rössner, 2014: Old world ruminant morphophysiology, life history, and fossil record: exploring key innovations of a diversification sequence. Annales Zoologici Fennici **51**, 80–94.

Codron, D., and M. Clauss, 2010: Rumen physiology constrains diet niche: linking digestive physiology and food selection across wild ruminant species. Canadian Journal of Zoology **88**, 1129–1138.

Cunningham, P. L., 2013: Plants included in the diet of Arabian Sand Gazelle (Reem) from Saudi Arabia. Journal of King Saud University - Science **25**, 167–173.

Dittmann, M. T., J. Hummel, S. Hammer, A. Arif, C. Hebel, D. W. H. Müller, J. Fritz, P. Steuer, A. Schwarm, M. Kreuzer, and M. Clauss, 2015: Digesta kinetics in gazelles in comparison to other ruminants: Evidence for taxon-specific rumen fluid throughput to adjust digesta washing to the natural diet. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part A **185**, 58–68.

Hofmann, R. R., 1973: The Ruminant Stomach - Stomach Structure and Feeding Habits of East African Game Ruminants. East African Literature Bureau, Nairobi, Kenya.

Hofmann, R. R., 1989: Evolutionary steps of ecophysiological adaptation and diversification of ruminants: a comparative view of their digestive system. Oecologia **78**, 443–457.

Hofmann, R. R., and G. Geiger, 1974: Zur topographischen und funktionellen Anatomie der Viscera abdominis des Rehes (*Capreolus capreolus* L.). Anatomia, Histologia, Embryologia **3**, 63–84.

Hofmann, R. R., W. J. Streich, J. Fickel, J. Hummel, and M. Clauss, 2008: Convergent evolution in feeding types: salivary gland mass differences in wild ruminant species. Journal of Morphology **269**, 240–257.

Hummel, J., M. Clauss, and W. Zimmermann, 2005: Fluid and particle retention in captive okapi (*Okapia johnstoni*). Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology - Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology **140**, 436–444.

Hummel, J., S. Hammer, C. Hammer, J. Ruf, M. Lechenne, and M. Clauss, 2015: Solute and particle retention in a small grazing antelope, the blackbuck (*Antilope cervicapra*). Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology **182**, 22–26.

Lauwers, H., 1973: Morfologische bijdrage tot de kennis von her resorberend vermogen van rundercoormagen. Meddelingen van de Faculteit Diergeneeskunde Rijksuniversiteit Gent **17**, 1–261.

Mathiesen, S. D., V. Rædergård, M. A. Vader, Ø. E. Haga, H. J. Norberg, W. Sørmo, and N. J. C. Tyler, 1999: Salivary glands in Svalbard reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus platyrhynchus*) and in Norwegian reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus tarandus*). Rangifer **19**, 25–32.

McLeod, K. R., and R. L. Baldwin, 2000: Effects of diet forage:concentrate ratio and metabolizable energy intake on visceral organ growth and in vitro oxidative capacity of gut tissues in sheep. Journal of Animal Science **78**, 771–783.

Nagy, J. G., and W. L. Regelin, 1975: Comparison of digestive organ size of three deer species. Journal of Wildlife Management **39**, 621–624.

Sauer, C., M. F. Bertelsen, P. Lund, M. R. Weisbjerg, and M. Clauss, (*in press*): Quantitative macroscopic anatomy of the giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*) digestive tract. Anatomia, Histologia, Embryologia

Short, H. L, 1964: Postnatal stomach development of white-tailed deer. Journal of Wildlife Management **28**, 445–458.

Stafford, K. J., and Y. M. Stafford, 1993: The anatomy of the omasum of some Zambian game species. Anatomia, Histologia, Embryologia **22**, 342–347.

Staaland, H., J. Adamczewski, and A. Gunn, 1997: A comparison of digestive tract morphology in muskoxen and caribou from Victoria Island, Northwest Territories, Canada. Rangifer **17**, 17–19.

Wang, J., H. Li, L. Zhang, Y. Zhang, M. Yue, B. Shao, and J. Wang, 2014: Histomorphometric characterization of forestomach of yak (*Bos grunniens*) in the Qinghai-Tibetan plateau. International Journal of Morphology **32**, 871–881.

Weston, R. H., and J. A. Cantle, 1983: Digestion studies with two sheep genotypes exhibiting a difference in voluntary roughage consumption. Proceedings of the Nutrition Society of Australia **8**, 177–180.

# Tables

**Table 1. Rumen, reticulum, omasum and abomasum size measures of blackbuck and sand gazelle. All values are presented as mean ± standard deviation**

| | Blackbuck | | | Sand gazelle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | BM (kg) | Measure | n | BM (kg) | Measure |
| Reticulorumen tissue weight (g) | 14 | 25.2 ± 3.3 | 449.8 ± 64.0 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 232.6 ± 20.5 |
| Rumen height (cm) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 26.9 ± 2.8 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 19.4 ± 1.6 |
| Dorsal rumen length (cm) | 12 | 24.8 ± 3.3 | 21.9 ± 2.5 | - | - | - |
| Ventral rumen length (cm) | 11 | 25.2 ± 3.2 | 22.9 ± 2.6 | - | - | - |
| Total rumen diagonal (cm) | 12 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 29.7 ± 3.5 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 19.7 ± 1.0 |
| Reticulum height (cm) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 9.4 ± 2.3 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 11.0 ± 2.1 |
| Reticulum length (cm) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 7.8 ± 1.3 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 5.3 ± 1.7 |
| Reticular crest height (mm) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 4.0 ± 1.3 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 1.6 ± 0.3 |
| Cranial rumen pillar thickness (mm) | 14 | 25.2 ± 3.3 | 7.2 ± 1.9 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 4.7 ± 1.0 |
| Caudal rumen pillar thickness (mm) | 14 | 25.2 ± 3.3 | 9.4 ± 2.2 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 5.7 ± 0.8 |
| Omasum tissue weight (g) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 20.9 ± 4.0 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 18.6 ± 3.4 |
| Omasum height (cm) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 5.0 ± 1.2 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 6.6 ± 0.9 |
| Omasum length (cm) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 3.5 ± 0.7 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 4.3 ± 0.5 |
| Omasal curvature length (cm) | 14 | 25.2 ± 3.3 | 6.6 ± 1.7 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 9.6 ± 1.4 |
| Number of omasal laminae | 5 | 26.3 ± 2.2 | 42 ± 3 | - | - | - |
| Surface area of omasal laminae ($cm^2$) | 5 | 26.3 ± 2.2 | 193.4 ± 28.7 | - | - | - |
| Abomasum tissue weight (g) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 150.4 ± 85.8 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 37.9 ± 5.5 |
| Greater abomasal curvature length (cm) | 12 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 24.8 ± 3.8 | - | - | - |
| Lesser abomasal curvature length (cm) | 12 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 18.2 ± 3.2 | - | - | - |

**Abbreviations used: BM = body mass.**

**Table 2. Intestinal size measures of blackbuck and sand gazelle. All values are presented as mean ± standard deviation**

| | Blackbuck | | | Sand gazelle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | BM (kg) | Measure | n | BM (kg) | Measure |
| Small intestine tissue weight (g) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.5 | 216.0 ± 69.1 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 123.7 ± 15.2 |
| Small intestine length (m) | 13 | 25.2 ± 3.4 | 11.2 ± 1.7 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 7.3 ± 0.8 |
| Total large intestine[1] tissue weight (g) | 13 | 25.4 ± 3.3 | 177.9 ± 53.3 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 128.4 ± 49.9 |
| Total large intestine[1] length (m) | 12 | 25.1 ± 3.2 | 4.1 ± 0.4 | 4 | 17.7 ± 1.3 | 2.0 ± 0.4 |
| Cecum tissue weight (g) | 13 | 24.8 ± 3.2 | 16.0 ± 4.3 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 16.9 ± 4.5 |
| Cecum length (cm) | 14 | 25.2 ± 3.3 | 14.5 ± 2.4 | 7 | 17.6 ± 1.1 | 14.7 ± 3.0 |
| Small intestine : Total large intestine[1] length | 11 | 25.2 ± 3.3 | 2.9 ± 0.5 | 4 | 17.7 ± 1.3 | 3.6 ± 1.1 |

**Abbreviations used: BM = body mass.**
**[1]Total large intestine was defined as cecum, colon and rectum.**

## Figure captions

Figure 1: Digestive tract of the blackbuck. Abbreviations used: DR = dorsal rumen, VR = ventral rumen, RE = reticulum, OM = omasum, A = abomasum, SI = small intestine, CE = cecum, and LI = large intestine. A) Blackbuck from Ree Park. B) Blackbuck from AWWP. Note the similar omasum size in animals from both institutions. Scale bars represent 15 cm.

Figure 2 : Position of the parotid and mandibular salivary glands of the blackbuck. The mandibular glands were positioned medially to the parotid glands. Courtesy of Jeanne Peter.

Figure 3: Comparison of selected internal reticuloruminal measures of blackbuck and sand gazelle to other species of ruminants. Each species is represented by a point, except for blackbuck and sand gazelle. Solid line: trendline for 'moose-type' ruminants, dashed line: trendline for 'cattle-type' ruminants.

Figure 4: Comparison of parotid and mandibular salivary gland weights of blackbuck to other species of ruminants. Each species is represented by a point, except for blackbuck. Solid line: trendline for 'moose-type' ruminants, dashed line: trendline for 'cattle-type' ruminants.

Figure 5: Comparison of omasum size parameters of blackbuck and sand gazelle to other species of ruminants. Each species is represented by a point, except for blackbuck and sand gazelle. Solid line: trendline for 'moose-type' ruminants, dashed line: trendline for 'cattle-type' ruminants.

## Figures




Figure 1: Digestive tract of the blackbuck. Scale bar represents 15 cm. Abbreviations used: DR = dorsal rumen, VR = ventral rumen, RE = reticulum, OM = omasum, A = abomasum, SI = small intestine, CE = cecum, and LI = large intestine. A) Blackbuck from Ree Park. B) Blackbuck from AWWP. Note the unusually small omasum in animals from both institutions.

(LOW RESOLUTION TO REDUCE FILE SIZE)




**Figure 2 : Position of the parotid and mandibular salivary glands of blackbuck. The mandibular glands were positioned medially to the parotid glands. Courtesy of Jeanne Peter.**




**Figure 3: Comparison of selected internal reticuloruminal measures of blackbuck and sand gazelle to other species of ruminants. Each species is represented by a point, except for blackbuck and sand gazelle. Solid line: trendline for 'moose-type' ruminants, dashed line: trendline for 'cattle-type' ruminants.**




**Figure 4: Comparison of parotid and mandibular salivary gland weights of blackbuck to other species of ruminants. Each species is represented by a point, except for blackbuck. Solid line: trendline for 'moose-type' ruminants, dashed line: trendline for 'cattle-type' ruminants.**




**Figure 5: Comparison of omasum size parameters of blackbuck to other species of ruminants. Each species is represented by a point, except for blackbuck. Solid line: trendline for 'moose-type' ruminants, dashed line: trendline for 'cattle-type' ruminants.**